

**MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
FISCAL NOTE (14-101)**

Subject

Initiative petition from Dan Viets regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to Article I of the Constitution of Missouri. (Received December 23, 2013)

Date

January 13, 2014

Description

This proposal would amend Article I of the Constitution of Missouri.

The amendment is to be voted on in November 2014.

Public comments and other input

The State Auditor's office requested input from the **Attorney General's office**, the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Insurance**, **Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Public Safety**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Governor's office**, the **Missouri House of Representatives**, the **Department of Conservation**, the **Department of Transportation**, the **Office of Administration**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, the **Missouri Senate**, the **Secretary of State's office**, the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **State Treasurer's office**, **Adair County**, **Boone County**, **Callaway County**, **Cass County**, **Clay County**, **Cole County**, **Greene County**, **Jackson County Legislators**, **Jasper County**, **St. Charles County**, **St. Louis County**, **Taney County**, the **City of Cape Girardeau**, the **City of Columbia**, the **City of Jefferson**, the **City of Joplin**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of Kirksville**, the **City of Kirkwood**, the **City of Mexico**, the **City of Raymore**, the **City of St. Joseph**, the **City of St. Louis**, the **City of Springfield**, the **City of Union**, the **City of Wentzville**, the **City of West Plains**, **Cape Girardeau 63 School District**, **Hannibal 60 School District**, **Rockwood R-VI School District**, **Linn State Technical College**, **Metropolitan Community College**, **University of Missouri** and **St. Louis Community College**.

Assumptions

Officials from the **Attorney General's office** indicated they assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development** indicated there will be no impact for their department.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** indicated the proposal has the potential to significantly impact the revenue stream of state and local governments; however, their department has no means to calculate such impact.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** indicated the proposal would not result in any costs or savings for their department. They noted; while a portion of the tax revenue generated by the proposal would potentially increase the funds available for higher education, including state scholarship programs administered by their department, the potential additional revenue is unknown and does not constitute a savings for their department.

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services** indicated this proposal would have no impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** indicated this petition will have no cost or savings to their department.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health** indicated this proposal creates no direct obligations or requirements to their department that would result in a fiscal impact. However, the impact on the demand for substance use disorder treatment is unknown. The department sees the legalization of marijuana as a broader public health issue, especially for children.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections** indicated:

Passage of this proposal may result in the release of offenders who are incarcerated for felony marijuana offenses or probation/ parole violators who have been returned to prison for misdemeanor or local ordinance marijuana offenses. This may have a positive fiscal impact in that it may reduce both the incarcerated population and the population supervised by Probation & Parole (P&P). Each day an offender is not incarcerated results in a cost avoidance of \$18.01 in incarceration costs while P&P per diems are \$5.07 per offender.

This legislation could also have an unknown operational impact in that it allows for the expungement of marijuana offenses from offender records. This may result in an additional workload for the institutional Records Office staff as they are the custodians of the offender records; however, it is not anticipated that the increased workload will be significant.

The petitions states it is not intended to "amend or affect in any way state or federal law pertaining to employment matters." While this will arguably provide some protections for the department to continue to test employees for marijuana, there is some ambiguity in the language or alternative interpretations of the language that may impede the department testing employees for marijuana use/impairment. There may be an unknown operational impact on the safety and security of the prisons if department is not allowed to test our staff for marijuana usage.

Passage of this proposal into law would have an unknown fiscal impact for the department, an impact which is assumed to be fiscally positive.

Officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** indicated there will be no fiscal impact for their department.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue** indicated this proposal will have no fiscal impact for the department, but it will increase state revenues by an unknown amount.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety** indicated:

Costs would increase by \$5,634,921 in FY 2015, \$4,718,729 in FY 2016, and \$4,778,049 in FY 2017. Excise tax and licensing fees could be \$142,500,000 in FY 2016 and FY 2017.

The Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control (ATC) will need to provide office space across the state for four District Offices in St. Louis, Kansas City, Springfield and Cape Girardeau. The existing ATC office in Jefferson City can absorb the additional staff within the existing location.

It is very likely that many small businesses will become licensed as a result of marijuana legalization and the potential to increase small business profits is huge based on information received from the state of Colorado, which just legalized recreational marijuana.

It is estimated that each new FTE will require laptops (or desktop PC's) and printing equipment. In addition, based on Colorado's estimation, ATC will need large marijuana tracking computer system to facilitate the tracking and excise tax collections which is estimated to cost \$1,000,000 in the first two years.

ATC will begin licensing marijuana growers, producers, distributors, and retailers. It is estimated it will have a large positive impact on Total State Revenue. Although the language indicates that the excise taxes will not be considered a part of total state revenue or expense of state government. ATC estimates that excise taxes collected will be based on Missouri marijuana sales of between \$750 million and \$1 billion annually, resulting in possibly \$112.5 million in excise tax collections if tax rates are the minimum 15%. ATC also estimates that if the minimum number of retail licenses allowed (1 license per 2,500 people, 6.022 million Missouri population) of 2,400 obtain licenses, plus possibly 600

producers or distributors, there will be 3,000 licensees. ATC proposes a fee of \$10,000 per license which would result in approximately \$30 million in license fees. This license fee is in line with the range of fees paid by Colorado licensees.

Section 35(a) 1, allows for citizens who are 21 years of age or older to engage in the production, sale, distribution and consumption of marijuana. It also legalizes the manufacturers of products from Industrial Hemp.

Section 35(a)2, sets out the purpose of this section to regulate the marijuana industry, raise revenue from licensing and excise taxes on marijuana, prevent criminal activity as a result of black market marijuana sales, prevent underage consumption of marijuana, eliminate illegal marijuana growth on public lands, and to allow for medical marijuana consumption. It also legalizes Industrial Hemp.

Section 35(a) 3, determines the goals of legalizing marijuana as preventing the distribution to those under age 21, preventing the revenue from going to criminal enterprises, preventing violence and the use of firearms in the cultivation and distribution of marijuana. It also prevents marijuana advertising to those under age 21.

Section 35(a) 4, provides definitions of terms used in this section. It removes the language dealing with the definition for "Expungeable marijuana offense." It also sets out household exemption limits of 8 ounces of usable marijuana, 12 ounces of marijuana products in solid form, 72 ounces of marijuana products in liquid form.

Section 35(a) 5, prohibits the state from making it illegal to possess or use marijuana by 21 year olds or older, to deliver or travel with marijuana, to purchase, sale or manufacture marijuana products and paraphernalia. It prevents seizures or forfeitures as a result of marijuana purchase, sale, manufacturing, production, processing, transportation, delivery, possession, or use of marijuana products.

35(a)6, allows state laws that address prohibiting import and export into and from within this state; the purchase, sale, manufacture, distribution, or delivery of marijuana within 1,000 feet of a school attended primarily by individuals under 21 years of age; the operation of a vehicle while using or under the influence; usage of marijuana in a public place; purchase, sale, manufacturing, production, processing transportation, delivery or possession by a person not in compliance with the law; classify the penalties, and impose an excise tax between 15% and 30% of the purchase price. This excise tax will not be a part of total state revenue and related expenditures not an expenditure of state government.

Section 35(a)7, requires the Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control (ATC) to promulgate rules and regulations that control and regulate the purchase, sale, manufacturing, production, processing, transportation, delivery, possession, and use of marijuana, including requiring a marijuana license to purchase, sell, manufacture, produce, process, transport or deliver marijuana; provide for excise tax collections; and provide for the enforcement of marijuana laws and review of their records and premises.

Also ATC will regulate the advertising. ATC must also receive and transfer all funds from excise taxes and license fees to a dedicated fund first to ATC. The collections in this dedicated fund shall: be appropriated from the General Assembly to carry out the obligations under this law, including a reserve to maintain a working cash balance; next to state and local law enforcement and firefighter pensions and retirement plans – 25%; public elementary and secondary education – 25%; mental health and substance abuse programs – 20%; cities and counties – 15%; and for public higher education for scholarships to attend such institutions – 15%.

Section 35(a) 8, provides that no state law shall: impose an extra tax on marijuana that is not generally imposed on other products; or make laws that make household limits for a person to have at any given time of less than 8 ounces of usable marijuana, 16 oz of marijuana in solid form, 72 oz in liquid form, and one ounce of marijuana extracts at any given time. The state may limit the number of retail licenses issued to no less than one marijuana retailer per 2,500 inhabitants in a county. The state cannot limit the number of licenses a person may be granted, or disallow a person from holding different types of licenses, or require them to be a Missouri resident. The state may not disallow a person from a license due to expugnable past marijuana offenses. The state may not require a consumer to purchase a license to buy marijuana, or to deliver marijuana without charge to another over 21 years of age provided that the marijuana was purchased from a licensed retailer or if the marijuana was home grown by the person delivering it. The state may not require a retailer to record information about the buyer. The state may not require a license for marijuana amounts that are less than the household exemption amounts. This subsection provides the guidelines for penalties for a manufacturer that grows more marijuana plants than the household exemption amounts. This subsection also restricts ATC from making regulations so burdensome that it makes it impractical to conduct business.

Section 35(a) 9, allows the Department of Health and Senior Services to promulgate rules and regulations to implement the medical marijuana provisions allowing Doctors to discuss marijuana usage in conjunction with a medical condition that would benefit from usage.

Section 35(a) 10, prevents a licensed doctor from being subjected to a criminal and civil penalties by any state licensing boards or commissions as a result of advising a person on medical marijuana usage.

Section 35(a) 11, directs and authorizes ATC to enforce, administer and make rules and regulations that are not inconsistent with this section.

Section 35(a) 12, directs and authorizes the Department of Health and Senior Services to enforce, administer and make rules and regulations that are not inconsistent with this section.

Section 35(a) 13, The General Assembly may make laws that control, regulate and tax the manufacture, production and delivery of industrial hemp.

Section 35(a) 14, regarding convictions of marijuana offenses being expungeable was removed and renumbered and now this section clarifies that contracts relating to the manufacturing, producing, delivering, possessing or using marijuana are not unenforceable just because they are prohibited by federal law.

Section 35(a)15, provides that the marijuana laws will have no affect on current state or federal laws pertaining to employment matters, landlord-tenant matters, real property contracts that prohibit marijuana manufacturing, production, distribution, possession or use on such real property.

Section 35(a) 16 provides that if any part of this section is invalidated, the remaining part shall not be affected.

Section 35(a) 17, provides for most of the provisions to become effective on January 1, 2015, except for the actual section that allows citizens over the age of 21 to engage in the production, sale, distribution, and consumption of marijuana and manufacturer of goods from hemp which will become effective on June 1, 2015.

The division is requesting approximately \$5.6 million in PS and E&E during the first year to respond to the tasks involved in marijuana legalization. Each year thereafter the cost would be between \$4.7 to \$4.8 million. ATC would be responsible for licensing, collecting excise taxes and regulatory compliance in a new marijuana industry in Missouri. ATC believes that the only way to track marijuana is through a computerized system using tax stamps. Colorado currently uses a system that cost \$1 million over a 2 year period. This system would track the product from the production to the retail system. Because there are no prohibitions against one person having all different types of marijuana licenses, the only way to assure excise taxes are being paid is through the use of tax stamps and frequent inspections. ATC would utilize five district offices throughout the state with 1 District Supervisor, 1 Clerical person and various Special Agent/Auditors in each District. ATC would need 5 District Supervisors, 45 Special Agent/Auditors, 7 Senior Office Support Assistants, 1 Staff Attorney and 1Agricultural Expert to facilitate such a large undertaking. It should be noted that Colorado, with a population of almost a million less, has 56 FTE dedicated solely to the marijuana control program.

Additional Information: The state of Washington's marijuana initiative allows up to \$5 million annually for the Washington State Liquor Control Board to implement and administer the recreational marijuana program. The Economic Revenue Forecast Council has not yet projected revenues but we suspect it will be in the 0-\$300 million range in the first full year of operation. No Washington marijuana licenses have been issued yet but the applications are approaching 3,000 as of December 19, 2013.

Officials from the **Department of Social Services** indicated through the excise tax imposed by these amendments, there is the potential to increase state revenues; however, there is no specific provision that any of that money would be appropriated to the

department. Although some portion of the revenue is to be allocated for mental health and substance abuse programs, which agency or agencies would benefit would be subjected to the appropriations process. Therefore, no fiscal impact to the department is anticipated.

Officials from the **Governor's Office** indicated this initiative petition will have no fiscal impact to their office.

Officials from the **House of Representatives** indicated this initiative petition will have no fiscal impact to their office.

Officials from the **Department of Conservation** indicated there will be no adverse fiscal impact on the department.

Officials from the **Department of Transportation** indicated they assume no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Office of Administration** indicated:

These initiative petitions create Article I, Section 35(a) in the Missouri Constitutions and changes or repeals certain sections of Articles I thru X and XII. Below summarizes the petitions and distinguishes the difference between the various versions. These petitions:

- Legalize the production, sale, distribution, and consumption of marijuana and hemp.
- Legalize the possession of marijuana, marijuana products, marijuana paraphernalia, marijuana extracts, and industrial hemp for persons twenty-one years of age or older.
- Legalize the cultivation of marijuana for medical needs as recommended by a physician.
- Legalize the retail sales of marijuana, marijuana products, marijuana paraphernalia, marijuana extracts, and industrial hemp.
- Allow the General Assembly to enact an excise tax on the fair market sale of marijuana and industrial hemp produced in the state.
 - Petitions 14-100 and 14-101 set the tax rate at not less than fifteen percent, but not more than thirty percent of the purchase price.
 - Petitions 14-102 at twenty-five percent.
 - Petitions 14-100 and 14-101 restrict the expenditures from this additional revenue to not be an "expense of the state government."
- Require the Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control to adopt regulations necessary for implementation by June 1, 2015 including:
 - Licensing procedures
 - Excise tax collection
 - Enforcement and compliance of licensees
 - Fee schedules
 - Advertisement regulation
- Require the Department of Health and Senior Services to adopt regulations necessary for implementation by June 1, 2015 that will permit individuals with medical conditions to use marijuana, marijuana products, marijuana paraphernalia, and marijuana extracts for medical use.

- Permit records expungement of marijuana offenses no longer illegal under this act.
 - Petitions 14-101 does not permit expungement of marijuana offenses no longer illegal under this act.
- Do not:
 - Allow the state to impose any additional taxes to transactions regarding marijuana, marijuana products, marijuana paraphernalia, marijuana extracts, and industrial hemp, other than what is imposed on other products generally.
 - Permit the state to add additional regulations related to licensees beyond the scope of the petition.
 - Require an employer to retain an employee impaired by the use of marijuana.
 - Forbid any individual or property owner from prohibiting marijuana within their property.
 - Require a person to violate or exempt them from enforcement of federal laws.
 - Permit operation of any means of transportation by anyone impaired by marijuana.
 - Permit the transfer or sale of marijuana, marijuana products, marijuana paraphernalia, marijuana extracts, and industrial hemp to anyone under the age of twenty-one.

Summary of Fiscal Impact

The Department of Corrections and the Office of the Court Administrator would incur costs (amount unknown) due to the expungement of records and release of offenders' provisions in the act.

Budget and Planning (B&P) assumes the revenue generated from the excise tax and license fees would be deposited into the state's general revenue fund. The petition requires the general assembly to appropriate the revenue as follows:

1. First all funds the General Assembly deems necessary for the division of alcohol and tobacco control within the department of public safety to carry out any obligations created by the petition or laws operating under this section, and may establish a reserve fund for such obligations.
2. The remainder of all funds shall be appropriated within the following guidelines:
 - a. 25% for state and local law enforcement and firefighter pensions
 - b. 25% for public institutions of elementary and secondary education
 - c. 20% for mental health and substance abuse programs
 - d. 15% for cities and counties
 - e. 15% for public institutions of higher education or for scholarships to attend such institutions

Further B&P assumes that the retail sale of marijuana, marijuana products, marijuana paraphernalia, marijuana extracts, and industrial hemp would be subject to state sales tax, therefore increasing the collections to the state's general revenue fund, the School District Trust Fund, the Conservation Commission Fund, the State Park Sales Tax Fund, and the Soil and Water Sales Tax Fund. B&P does not have the data available to provide an estimate.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** indicated:

The proposed initiative petition would create a new section of the Missouri Constitution to be known as Article I, Section 35(a). This section would allow citizens over the age of twenty-one years to have the right to engage in the production, sale, distribution and consumption of marijuana and the manufacture of goods from hemp, subject to reasonable regulations adopted by the state pursuant to this section.

During the past five years (2009 – 2013) there has been an average of 3,100 Associate Circuit Division charges disposed statewide by guilty outcome and 8,256 Circuit Division charges disposed by guilty outcome. We are unable to determine what number of these charges were for someone over the age of twenty-one.

The following Criminal Court Costs would be affected by this petition:

Criminal Court Costs		
Felony Case Costs	Amount of Cost	Disburse to State/County
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund surcharge	\$10.00	State of Missouri - Basic Civil Legal Services Fund
Clerk Fee	\$45.00	State of Missouri - General Revenue \$36, County \$9
County Fee	\$75.00	County
Court Automation Fund Fee	\$7.00	State of Missouri -Statewide Court Automation Fund
Court Reporter fee (All Circuit Division Cases)	\$15.00	State of Missouri - General Revenue
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund surcharge	\$7.50	State of Missouri - Crime Victims' Compensation Fund
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund surcharge	\$30.00	State of Missouri - DNA Profiling Analysis Fund
Brain Injury Fund surcharge	\$2.00	State of Missouri - Head Injury Fund
Independent Living Center Fund surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Independent Living Center Fund
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund
Peace Officer Standards & Training (POST) Commission surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Peace Officer Standards & Training Fund
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorneys' Retirement Fund	\$4.00	Pros. Attorney Retirement Fund

Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund
Sheriffs' Fee	\$75.00	County
Sheriffs' Retirement Fund surcharge (except 21st Circuit)	\$3.00	Sheriffs' Retirement Fund
Spinal Cord Injury Fund surcharge	<u>\$2.00</u>	State of Missouri - Spinal Cord Injury Fund
Total	\$279.50	
Misdemeanor Case Costs		
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund surcharge	\$8.00	State of Missouri - Basic Civil Legal Services Fund
Clerk Fee	\$15.00	\$12 State of Missouri / \$3 County
County Fee	\$25.00	County
Court Automation Fund Fee	\$7.00	State of Missouri - Court Automation Fund
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund surcharge	\$7.50	State of Missouri - Crime Victims' Compensation Fund
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund surcharge	\$15.00	State of Missouri - DNA Profiling Analysis Fund
Brain Injury Fund surcharge	\$2.00	State of Missouri - Brain Injury Fund
Independent Living Center Fund surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Independent Living Center Fund
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund
Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Commission surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Peace Officer Standards & Training Fund
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorneys' Retirement Fund	\$4.00	Pros. Attorney Retirement Fund
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund surcharge	\$1.00	\$0.50 State of Missouri / \$0.50 County
Sheriffs' fee	\$10.00	County
Sheriffs' Retirement Fund surcharge (except 21st Circuit)	\$3.00	Sheriffs' Retirement fund
Spinal Cord Injury Fund Surcharge	\$2.00	State of Missouri - Spinal Cord Injury Fund
Total	\$102.50	

Municipal Case (Filed in Associate Division) Costs		
Clerk Fee	\$15.00	\$12 State of Missouri / \$3 County
Court Automation Fund Fee	\$7.00	State of Missouri - Court Automation Fund
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund surcharge	\$7.50	State of Missouri - Crime Victims' Compensation Fund
Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Commission surcharge	\$1.00	State of Missouri - Peace Officer Standards & Training Fund
Sheriffs' Retirement Fund surcharge	\$3.00	Sheriffs' Retirement Fund
Total	\$33.50	
Criminal Costs Not Included Above		
Drug Testing by a State Lab	\$150.00	State of Missouri
Drug Testing by a Private Lab	Actual Costs	County Reimbursement
Law Enforcement Arrest Costs:		
Highway Patrol		Amt. Approved by the Court
Local (County)		Amt. Approved by the Court
Municipal		Amt. Approved by the Court

The decrease in the court fees, depending on the number of cases, will result in an unknown loss to the courts.

We also assume there will be an unknown decrease in caseload for the courts because the courts will no longer process these cases; however, at this time we are unable to calculate the decrease.

Any significant increase or decrease will be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials from the **Missouri Senate** indicated there will be no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Secretary of State's office** indicated their office is required to pay for publishing in local newspapers the full text of each statewide ballot measure as directed by Article XII, Section 2(b) of the Missouri Constitution and Section 116.230-116.290,

RSMo. The Secretary of State's office is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. Funding for this item is adjusted each year depending upon the election cycle with \$1.3 million historically appropriated in odd numbered fiscal years and \$100,000 appropriated in even numbered fiscal years to meet these requirements. The appropriation has historically been an estimated appropriation because the final cost is dependent upon the number of ballot measures approved by the General Assembly and the initiative petitions certified for the ballot. In FY 2013, at the August and November elections, there were 5 statewide Constitutional Amendments or ballot propositions that cost \$2.17 million to publish (an average of \$434,000 per issue). Therefore, the Secretary of State's office assumes, for the purposes of this fiscal note, that it should have the full appropriation authority it needs to meet the publishing requirements. However, because these requirements are mandatory, we reserve the right to request funding to meet the cost of our publishing requirements if the Governor and the General Assembly change the amount or eliminate the estimated nature of our appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** indicated this initiative petition will have some impact on the State Public Defender System. In Fiscal Year 2013 the State Public Defender provided representation in an estimated 3,315 marijuana cases. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of any recognized standards. Removing these cases would assist public defenders by providing some caseload relief, moving toward more recognized standards.

Officials from the **State Treasurer's office** indicated this initiative petition will have no fiscal impact to their office.

Officials from the **City of Jefferson** indicated there is not expected to be a fiscal impact to their city.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** indicated they are unable to estimate the increase in sales tax revenues or the increase in costs that this initiative petition would generate. There would be no savings.

Officials from the **City of St. Joseph** indicated this petition could result in additional revenues for the city's police and fire pensions and for enforcement of laws pertaining to marijuana in general. It could also be a financial support to local mental health facilities, suffering from the cuts in federal and state assistance. It's not clear if the cost of enforcing the new proposed laws would offset any savings from no longer enforcing current laws on the matter.

Neither the amount of potential revenue from the proposed excise taxes and business licenses nor the level of increased (or decreased) expenses can be calculated.

Officials from **University of Missouri** indicated this petition could potentially see some positive benefits through scholarships to students that could be funded as a result of this initiative; however, the impact is not determinable.

The State Auditor's office did not receive a response from the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, **Adair County**, **Boone County**, **Callaway County**, **Cass County**, **Clay County**, **Cole County**, **Greene County**, **Jackson County Legislators**, **Jasper County**, **St. Charles County**, **St. Louis County**, **Taney County**, the **City of Cape Girardeau**, the **City of Columbia**, the **City of Joplin**, the **City of Kirksville**, the **City of Kirkwood**, the **City of Mexico**, the **City of Raymore**, the **City of St. Louis**, the **City of Springfield**, the **City of Union**, the **City of Wentzville**, the **City of West Plains**, **Cape Girardeau 63 School District**, **Hannibal 60 School District**, **Rockwood R-VI School District**, **Linn State Technical College**, **Metropolitan Community College**, and **St. Louis Community College**.

Fiscal Note Summary

State government expects \$1 million in startup costs and annual operating costs starting at \$4.6 million, possibly offset by unknown savings in the criminal justice system. Legislative and agency actions will impact potential increased state revenue. The annual revenue increase could possibly exceed \$142 million. The fiscal impact to local governments is unknown.